RS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/818,185	03/14/97	SCHNIER	R RO996-140

LM21/1117

S JARED PITTS
SCHMEISER OLSEN AND WATTS
20 WEST FIRST STREET
MESA AZ 85201

EXAMINER
VU, T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2756	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _Mar 14, 1997_ _____ .

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ____ _3_ ____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

   ☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ _____ is/are pending in the application.

      Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

   ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

   ☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ _____ is/are rejected.

   ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

   ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

   ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

   ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ____ _Mar 14, 1997_ ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

   ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

   ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

   ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

   ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

      ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None   of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

         ☐ received.

         ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

         ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

      *Certified copies not received: _____ .

   ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

   ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

   ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

   ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

   ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

   ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because

reference characters "200" and "220" have both been used to designate as client system in Fig 3

and Fig 4. Correction is required.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The Corporate name

such as IBM should be removed from IBM Docket RO996-140. Appropriate correction is

required.

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the client system 224

[page 21 line 19] should be client system 200 such as Fig 4 describes. Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall
> not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al

[5,737,607] in view of Tang et al [5,793,365]

As per claim 1, Hamilton et al disclose *An apparatus comprising: at least one processor ;*

a memory coupled to the at least one processor [col 5 line 29] *; a computer program residing in*

the memory [col 5 line 34] .Eventhough Hamliton disclose using Corba and Java on his

application but Hamilton does not teach *computer program including a object reference server*

mechanism. However Tang et al disclose in his system and method providing access to distributed

workgroup members, by saying object reference of a communication server [Tang col 14 line

29]; *said object reference server mechanism delivering and object reference for a naming object*

to a remote second apparatus upon request of said second apparatus scuh as naming serveice

[Tang col 13 line 64]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Tang application inwhich used the object

reference server and naming service into Hamilton system in order to provide the dynamic

security comunications between servers and clients. By this rationale claim 1 is rejected.

As per claim 2,Hamilton-Tang disclose *the object reference server mechanism comprises a*

web server such as communication server [Tang col 8 line 6].By this rationale claim 2 is rejected.

As per claim 3 Hamilton-Tang disclose *the second apparatus comprises a web browser* such

as Internet browser [Hamilton col 1 line 66]. By this rationale claim 3 is rejected.

As per claim 4 Hamilton-Tang disclose *the object reference is stored in a web server*

directory by saying directory service [tang col 11 line 39].By this rationale claim 4 is rejected.

As per claims 5,6, Hamilton-Tang disclose *the object reference comprises a stringified*

object reference [Tang col 12 line 47] and *a root naming context object* is inherent when the

stringified object reference applied on the directory service . By this rationale claims 5,6, are

rejected

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al

[5,737,607] in view of Tang et al [5,793,365] and further in view of Van Hoff [5,727,147]

As per claim 7 Hamilton-Tang does not disclose *a method for bootstrapping an object client*

to a remote object server wherein the object server includes a plurality of objects including at

least one naming context object, the method comprising the steps of

> *a) creating an object reference for said at least one naming context object;*

> *b) storing said object reference in a object reference server directory;*

> *c) downloading said object reference from said object reference server directory to an*

object client when said object client attempts to access objects on said remote object server.

However Van Hoff in his method using object oriented program such as a program interpreter

resolves references to remotely servers; and the client computer's bootstrap class loader [Van

Hoff col 2 line 56]. Van Hoff teach the bootstrap class loader includes both a class references and

data references was HotJava browser [Van Hoff col 4 line 61]; remotely stored file [Van Hoff col

7 line 39]; and a browser such as Hot Java, identifies an application program for downloading to

local memory [Van Hoff col 6 line 49] . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Van Hoff 's

bootstrapping technique on clients /servers environment into Hamilton - Tang system in order to

provide information dynamically between servers and clients. By this rationale claim 7 is rejected.

Claims 8, 9, 10 contain the same limitations that were addressed in rejecting claims 4,5,6

above. By the same rationale applied above, claims 8,9,10 are rejected.

As per claims 11,17 Hamilton-Tang disclose *the step of downloading said object reference*

from said object reference server directory comprises downloading by a web server application

such as email application or text chat application [Tang col 12 line 66].By this rationale claim

11,17 are rejected.

As per claim 12 Hamilton-Tang disclose *the step of downloading said object reference from*

said object reference server directory comprises downloading a uniform resource locator for

said object reference to said web browser and said web browser requesting said object reference

using said uniform resource locator from said web server application by saying a browser can

download and execute interactive scripts [Hamilton col 2 line 9] inwhich the URL is inherently of

browser activities. By this rationale claim 12 is rejected.

As per claims 13,14, 15,16 Hamilton-Tang disclose the Java applet , Java ORB, Java enable web browser such as the Java ORB implementation [Hamilton col 7 line 40]. By this rationale claim 13,14, 15,16 is rejected.

As per claim 18 Hamilton-Tang disclose *the object server includes a name object server* such as a communication server name and machine id, or an object reference for the communication server [Tang col 14 line 33].By this rationale claim 18 is rejected.

Claims 19-21,24-28,31-32 contain the same limitations that were addressed in rejecting claims 1-18 above. By the same rationale applied above, claims 19-21,24-28,31-32 are rejected.

As per claims 22,23,29,30 Hamilton-Tang disclose the recordable media and transmission media such as local hard disk [Tang col 11 line 16] .By this rationale claims 22,23,29,30 are rejected.

Conclusion

6.   All claims are rejected.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays during the same hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Frank Asta*, can be reached on *(703) 305-3817 or via e-mail addressed to [Frank.Asta@uspto.gov]*. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-6606.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to **[thong.vu@uspto.gov]**.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thong Vu
Nov 2, 1998

FRANK J. ASTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700